

Mr. WHITE. A loss of industry or a lack of industry rather because you want to come and set up business in a place with no educated work force. It's not good for industry, it's not good for business and it's not good for the economy of Vermont.

Ms. BLACK. There there's the cycle that if industry doesn't come because there's not an educated work force, we don't have any incentive for out-of-state families to move in because they realize there's not a future for their children here and then there are even less people in which case there is less of a tax base to help pay for the higher education and less people that will stay.

Mr. WHITE. The University of Vermont, for example, even for an in-state student, as we said, charges more than SUNY at Stonybrook or any of the—U.C. Berkeley. It's very expensive for a Vermont student if they want to stay in state or go to UVM or Castleton or any of the number of state schools. It's just far too expensive, \$7200 in tuition.

Ms. BLACK. In state and for students in the southern area of Vermont, North Adams State is almost closer than the University of Vermont and it's almost \$2,000 less expensive for an out-of-stater from Vermont than in state in—Vermont, so why would they stay?

Mr. WHITE. We're exporting basically our best and brightest out of state. In Europe, at least in Germany, they have a system where you can go for free but the only—the only—the drawback to that is you have to be in the top of the top of the top. Not everybody gets an opportunity to go on to university in some European countries.

Ms. BLACK. In the midwestern states there's both state and federal funding. Well, in every state there's both state and federal funding to public higher education, but in Vermont it's a lot lower. And if we had the process where the federal government would match state funds, it would give smaller states like Vermont more of an initiative to fund the higher education.

Anybody who has the ability should be able to go to their state university. I mean, not everybody could get into the top schools, but everybody should have the chance to go to a school for higher education because it's getting harder and harder to get a decent job where you can make any sort of a living without a college education.

Mr. LAFARGE. More and more people are going to college every year, but even people that get say a four-year degree aren't even going to make as high a wage as would be expected, so people who just go to high school are going to be left behind and may be stuck to factory jobs or, you know, just—

Mr. WHITE. The numbers, in fact, show the disparity between even a master's degree—a person with a master's and a person with a four-year degree and a person with a high school degree. It shows the disparity, the numbers which I don't have obviously, but there's a great disparity between the amount of money that each of those people would make.

Twenty percent of our budget is spent on defense. Well, it seems to me that since there are no real wars going on, and not to parrot what everyone else has said, but it seems as though really defense should—should and could be cut.

Ms. BLACK. I think that even if it would mean raising income taxes and I know people are complaining that taxes are too high and that education is too expensive, but you've got to—you know, the public needs to understand the long-range effect of having education accessible because if they were willing to put up with a small increase in the income tax or the taxes that this money could be drawn from, then if people could go to col-

lege, they would—they could make more money and the economy would be increased as a whole and the property values would go up as a whole and in the long term that small increase would not seem as large.

Mr. WHITE. Plus it's cheaper to educate people and to have them get jobs than to support them on welfare or to support them in other ways when they can't find jobs down the line. It's a lot cheaper, it's a better investment.

Ms. BLACK. I think in fact that—I think taxes are high for everybody now and I think hopefully what this raising the taxes would do would be to give aid to the people who couldn't normally attend college and you'd—although I know people who don't have as high incomes don't feel like they want to be paying taxes, it seems as if it would benefit them the most if they could help—if everybody had their taxes raised a small amount, it would benefit them as well.

HONORING THE NORTH CENTRAL REGION, UNITED PARCEL SERVICE

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1997

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work and dedication of the North Central Region of United Parcel Service in appreciation for their efforts to assist people in moving off of welfare and into positive work experiences.

United Parcel Service has demonstrated outstanding leadership as a private employer who seeks to employ and train individuals who need critical job skills to compete in today's job market.

United Parcel Service is one of the largest users of the Federal Work Opportunity Tax Credit program [WOTC]. The WOTC encourages private companies to seek and train individuals who are making the transition from welfare to work. In fact, for the 1997 year, UPS is on target to hire 861 employees in Illinois who qualify for the Federal program.

United Parcel Service's commitment and impact on the community is not only deserving of congressional recognition, but should serve as a model for others to follow.

At a time when our Nation's leaders are asking the people of this country to make serving their community a core value of citizenship, honoring United Parcel Service is both timely and appropriate.

I urge this body to identify and recognize other private employers in their communities who could also participate in the Work Opportunity Tax Credit Program as United Parcel Service has.

ELIMINATING THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, for years certain National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] projects have attracted a great deal of controversy. Americans have been inundated with reports of grotesque live performances, blas-

phemous art exhibits, and obscene publications—all supported by taxpayer money. Regardless of the reforms Congress has tried to impose on the NEA, taxpayer money continues to filter down and fund controversial art. Now more than ever, we need to put an end to this inefficient cycle by admitting that the Federal Government has no business funding the arts and eliminate the NEA.

I support the arts and recognize their importance to our society. However, I believe it is our responsibility as citizens to keep it thriving on the local level. Yesterday, the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee voted to terminate the NEA. I believe that it is time to place a priority on balancing the budget and relieve the American family's crushing tax burden by eliminating the NEA and other inefficient Federal Programs.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the arts will continue to thrive without the existence of the NEA. Last year, more than \$9 billion was spent on the arts in America by the private sector. The fiscal year 1997 NEA budget of \$99.5 million represents only 1 percent of these private sector contributions.

Interestingly enough, despite a 40-percent cut in Federal funds over the last 2 years, the arts industry is booming—attendance rates are up, employment in the arts is up, total receipts from performing arts is up. Yet American families, already overtaxed and threatened by looming Federal debt, were forced to pony up \$99 million last year for the NEA.

Mr. Speaker, during its time of tight budgetary constraints, I encourage all of my colleagues to make a serious attempt to distinguish between essential and nonessential Government programs. The Federal Government should not be in the business of supporting the arts. The time to eliminate the NEA is now.

REPUBLICAN CHICKEN LITTLES

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1997

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, people talk frequently in this House about the need for accountability, but it is too often a case of Members here demanding that others be held accountable. A little self-accountability would go a very long way in this institution, and the recent article by Mark Shields on the minimum wage in the Saturday, June 14 issue of the Washington Post does a good deal to hold Members of Congress accountable for things they have said.

As Mr. Shields points out, when we debated the minimum wage in the previous Congress, many Republican Members predicted that an increase in the minimum wage would be an economic and social disaster. They could hardly have been more wrong. As Mr. Shields shows, while most Republicans opposed the increase in minimum wage and many of the Republican leaders predicted that increasing it would be disastrous, Republicans were wrong.

As Mr. Shields notes, directly contrary to the Republican predictions, which apparently grew organically out of their view of economic reality, today, with the increased minimum wage in effect for 8½ months, we see "no adverse effect on the employment of young workers